



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/680,792	10/06/2000	Stefan Georg Hild	RSW9-2000-0075-US1	2903

7590 12/03/2003

A Bruce Clay  
IBM Corporation T81/503  
P O Box 12195  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER

KUMAR, UTTAM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2157	3

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/680,792

Applicant(s)

HILD ET AL.

Examiner

Uttam Kumar

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1,2, 5, 6, 9-17, 20, 21, 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dutta et al (U.S. 6,615,212)

3. As to claims 1, 6, 16, 21, 26 and 27, Dutta et al discloses a dynamically provided content processor for transcoding data types at intermediate stages of transcoding process that teaches:

- Receiving a request for content from a client, wherein the request includes a set of characteristics or identification information (column 5, line 66-column 5).
- Selecting a transcoder from a set of transcoders having a best match to the set of characteristics, or identification information, and transcoding, or processing, the content using the transcoder to form transcoded content (column 7, line 63-column 8, line11).

As to claims 2, 9, 17 and 24, Dutta et al teaches sending transcoded content to the client (column 7, lines 34-37).

As to claim 5, 10, 20 and 25, the Dutta et al teaches the client is one of a personal digital assistant, a laptop computer, and a personal computer (column 5, lines 34-37).

As to claim 11, Dutta et al teaches:

- a bus system (column 4, lines 6-10),
- a communications unit connected to the bus system (column 3, lines 54-65),
- a memory connected to the bus system, wherein the memory includes a set of instructions (column 4, lines 10-14),
- a processing unit connected to the bus unit connected to the bus system (column 4, lines 6-10), wherein the processing unit executes the set of instructions described by claim 1 and taught by Dutta et al as shown above.

As to claim 12, Dutta et al teaches the bus system is a single bus (column 4, lines 6-10).

As to claim 13, Dutta et al teaches the bus system includes a primary bus and a secondary bus (column 4, lines 12-15).

As to claim 14, Dutta et al teaches the processing unit includes a plurality of processors (column 4, lines 6-8).

As to claim 15, Dutta et al teaches the communications unit is one of a modem and Ethernet adapter (column 3, lines 54-65). The Internet as described in the cited paragraph can be accessed using a modem and/or an Ethernet adapter through a local area network.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 18, 19, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta et al (U.S. 6,615,212) in view of Musciano et al ("HTML – The Definitive Guide).

6. As to claims 3, 7, 18 and 22, Dutta et al teaches all the limitations of claims 1, 6, 16 and 21 as described above. Dutta et al further teaches HTML is one format that the request can be made in (column 5, lines 56-60).

7. Dutta et al does not teach the set of characteristics includes a content type and a set of client characteristics.

8. Musciano et al teaches the set of characteristics include a content type and a set of client characteristics (page 321). The table shows attributes of the client that can be passed through an HTML request. The content type is described by the *form\_content* field.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a content type and a set of client characteristics in an HTML request to be transcoded as taught by Dutta et al. The motivation to do so would be so that the right transcoder can be used to properly process the request.

9. As to claims 4, 8, 19 and 23, Dutta et al teaches all the limitations of claims 1, 6, 16 and 21 as described above. Dutta et al further teaches HTML is one format that the request can be made in (column 5, lines 56-60).

10. Dutta et al does not teach the set of characteristics is a tuple including parameters for a document type definition, an application, a device, and a user (page 329). On page 329, there is an example of a simple HTML form example. The form demonstrates how the <input...> tag can be used to pass the above information in an HTML request.

11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include parameters for a document type definition, an application, a device and a user in an HTML request to be transcoded as taught by Dutta et al. The motivation to do so would be so that the right transcoder can be used to properly transcode the request.

### ***Conclusion***

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. 6,611,876

Barrett et al.

#### ***Method for Establishing Optimal Intermediate Caching Points by Grouping Program Elements in a Software System***

This patent describes a transcoder system similar to that of the applicant's.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uttam Kumar whose telephone number is 703-305-0719. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30-5; Every other Friday 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 703-308-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-305-3719.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Uttam Kumar  
Art Unit 2157  
November 21, 2003

  
ARIO ETIENNE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100